



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,476	03/16/2004	Kenichi Mitsumori	9281/4823	1781

7590 08/25/2006

Anthony P. Curtis, Ph.D.
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER

STINSON, FRANKIE L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1746

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/801,476

Applicant(s)

MITSUMORI ET AL.

Examiner

FRANKIE L. STINSON

Art Unit

1746

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10-12 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 8 and 10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 4, 6, 11 and 12 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over either Holden (U. S. Pat. No. 2,498,737) or Scarpa (U. S. Pat. No. 3,433,461).

Re claim 2, for example Holden and Scarpa are each cited disclosing an ultrasonic vibrator comprising:

a vibrating portion (2 in Scarpa and 6 in Holden);

a side wall portion (side wall as at 3a in Scarpa and side wall as at 28 in Holden)

standing on the principal surface of said vibrating portion; and

a vibrator body (1 in Scarpa and 11 in Holden) disposed on the principal surface of said vibrating portion inside said sidewall portion so as to apply ultrasonic vibration to said vibrating portion,

wherein a thin portion (28 in Holden and 3a, 4 in Scarpa) is formed at least on a said vibrating portion and said sidewall portion that differs from the claim only in the recitation the thin portion being formed at least on a part of the border. Nonetheless, to have the thin portion located as claimed, is deemed to be a mere matter of design in that as claimed, no new nor unobvious results are realized in the instant arrangement.

Re claim 4, note Holden col. 4, line 29 thru col. 5, line 17. Re claims 6, Holden and Scarpa disclose the frequency in the ultrasonic range (generally above 20kHz) and

therefore the frequency range as claimed is taught by the prior art. Re claim 11, Scarpa discloses the box shape. Re claim 12, Scarpa's arrangement can be described as planar, although not completely.

3. Applicant's arguments filed July 14, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In regard to the remarks that the arrangements in Scarpa and Holden fail to show the thin portion at the border, please note that the is considered to be a mere rearrangement of parts (see MPEP 2144.04 REVERSAL, DUPLICATION OR RE-ARRANGEMENT OF PARTS)

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Knecht et al., Straube, Bouyoucos, note the vibrators.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKIE L. STINSON whose telephone number is (571) 272-1308. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and some Saturdays from approximately 5:30 am to 11:30 am.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr, can be reached on (571) 272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

Art Unit: 1746

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

fls



FRANKIE L. STINSON
Primary Examiner
GROUP ART UNIT 1746